

Postmodern Concepts of Musical Time

Jonathan D. Kramer

While postmodernism is a difficult concept to define rigorously, it is possible to characterize postmodern music by the some or all of the following traits. It

1. is not simply a repudiation of modernism or its continuation, but has aspects of both;
2. is, on some level and in some way, ironic;
3. does not respect boundaries between sonorities and procedures of the past and of the present;
4. seeks to break down barriers between “highbrow” and “lowbrow” styles;
5. shows disdain for the often unquestioned value of structural unity;
6. refuses to accept the distinction between elitist and populist values;
7. avoids totalizing forms (e.g., does not allow an entire piece to be tonal or serial or cast in a prescribed formal mold);

8. includes quotations of or references to music of many traditions and cultures;
9. embraces contradictions;
10. distrusts binary oppositions;
11. includes fragmentations and discontinuities;
12. encompasses pluralism and eclecticism;
13. presents multiple meanings and multiple temporalities;
14. locates meaning and even structure in listeners, more than in scores, performances, or composers.

Certain of these characteristics stand out as particularly relevant to the time structures of music and music perception: we should expect postmodern musical time to be created at least as much by listeners as by composers, to differ from one listener to another, and to be fragmented, discontinuous, nonlinear, and multiple. The notion of the multiplicity of musical time—that music can enable listeners to experience different senses of directionality, different temporal narratives, and/or different rates of motion, all *simultaneously*—is indeed postmodern.

This paper will consider multiple musical time in three works from the past. I am not labeling Beethoven's String Quartet in F Major, op. 135, the finale of Mahler's Seventh Symphony, or Ives's *Putnam's Camp* as postmodern works, but rather saying that they contain temporal structures which can be understood as postmodernist in today's cultural climate. This apparent historical anomaly—works composed prior to the modernist period being put forth as having postmodernist characteristics—is possible if we understand postmodernism as an attitude more than as a historical period. The "post" in "postmodernism" thus means not so much "chronologically after"

as “a reinterpretation of” modernism.¹

To a greater extent than in music that I would not comfortably align with the traits of postmodernism listed above, these three compositions locate their temporal structures in some ways in the listener. I am not trying to show how the music objectively is, but rather to suggest how postmodern listeners may understand its temporality. I of course do not mean to imply that the music does not matter to the listener: structures that are objectively in these pieces suggest a multiple-time hearing of them. The temporalities I am describing come from an interaction between these structures and a postmodern listening stance. If this sounds a bit like a blurring of the distinction between piece, analysis, and perception, I accept that as a quintessentially postmodern attitude. I will describe the pieces as they may be constituted in the postmodern mind. This mental representation is informed by the objective nature of the music, by concepts of postmodernism, by who the listener is, and by the various performances the listener may have heard of this music.

Before turning to the pieces by Beethoven, Mahler, and Ives, I want to discuss a special type of temporal multiplicity that I call “multiply-directed time.” My book *The Time of Music* defines a multiply-directed piece as one “in which the direction of motion is so frequently interrupted by discontinuities, in which the music goes so often to unexpected places, that the . . . [sense of linear motion through time], though still a potent structural force, seems reordered.”²

The book offers the following hypothetical example, based on

¹According to Mas’ud Zavarzadeh and Donald Morton, the prefix “certainly does not mean ‘after,’ since such an understanding of it will take us back to history as ‘progress’ again. . . . If one takes ‘(post)’ in the sense of an ‘after,’ one has posited a traditional notion of history based upon ‘period’—a unique, homogeneous segment of time which in its totality represents the ‘spirit of an age.’ Only traditional modernists read (post)modernism in this way. . . . Those who oppose such a progressive, linear notion of history and believe that history is in itself a problematic issue (since it is only a representation . . .), regard ‘(post)’ to be a sign of ‘reading,’ interpretation, and ‘textuality.’ For these, (post)modernism would mean the re-reading or textualization of modernity.” See *Theory, (Post)Modernity, Opposition: An “Other” Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory* (Washington, DC: Maisonnette, 1991), 108.

²Jonathan D. Kramer, *The Time of Music* (New York: Schirmer, 1988), 46.

suggestions Karlheinz Stockhausen made in his composition seminars at the University of California, Davis, in 1966–67:

Passage *A* grows softer. Passage *B*, which is *pianissimo*, can function as the goal of passage *A* even if *B* does not follow *A* immediately. Suppose furthermore that *A* is also becoming more dense texturally. Then either passage *B* (soft and, let us assume, sparse) or some passage *C* (loud and dense) can serve as a goal of *A*. Passage *A* progresses in two directions at once, either of which may or may not lead immediately to a goal. I am suggesting not only that some passages can progress in more than one direction at once but also that their continuations need not follow them directly. When some processes in a piece move toward one (or more) goal(s) yet the goal(s) is (are) placed elsewhere than at the ends of the processes, the temporal continuum is multiple.³

This hypothetical structure depends on what might be called the “parametric concept.” A number of modernist composers in the mid-twentieth century thought of the various parameters of music (e.g., duration, pitch, register, timbre, loudness, etc.⁴) as separable. This idea lies behind “total” or multi-parameter serialism, in which each parameter has its own construction (actually, the same serial structures often govern many parameters, so that the theoretical independence of parameters was used to render them isomorphic). Once listeners understand loudness and textural density, for example, as independent, they can comprehend each of these parameters as providing its own sense of direction.

Thus far, I have presented these ideas as essentially modernist: a structuralist attempt to redefine musical temporality by creating independent structures in different parameters. But there are undercurrents of postmodernist thinking evident as well, because what

³Ibid.

⁴Different composers had different concepts of the basic parameters. Some differentiated between the inherent parameters of sound and the particular parameters of a given passage or piece.

the parametric concept actually does is deconstruct the previously holistic idea of musical structure. Thus, I will offer a parametric analysis of a proto-postmodern work—the finale of Mahler’s Seventh Symphony—which tries to show how that movement can be understood as temporally multiple: each of five parameters has its own quasi-independent structure. The five temporalities, I will argue, operate in counterpoint with one another, creating—at least for this particular postmodern listener—a richly multiple time sense.

Gestural Time in Beethoven’s Quartet op. 135

But first, Beethoven. The first movement of his Quartet op. 135 uses musical time as material as well as context. The music not only unfolds in time but also unfolds time itself. Its meaning (at least for me) depends on a re-ordered linearity created not by the performers and perhaps not even by the composer but mentally by the listener. It may take a postmodern sensibility, more likely to be understood and articulated in the late twentieth century than earlier, to understand such temporal manipulations. It may well be that they can be understood and experienced as postmodern only in an age of postmodernism. Or, more carefully put (since the idea of a “postmodern age” would make postmodernism into a historical period), the postmodernism of such works resides not in the music but in the way listeners (and critics and analysts and performers) understand them *today*. They have become postmodern as we have become postmodern.

My book *The Time of Music* analyzes the Beethoven movement, among other works, to show how the linearity of musical time is deconstructed. It is relevant to the present discussion to summarize and recast this analysis as a postmodernist view of the movement.⁵ Piece time (i.e., the normal succession of events) is contradicted by what I

⁵When I first published this analysis in 1973, I thought of it as a modernist view of a classical-period piece. Returning to it nearly twenty-five years later, I now understand my ideas on this movement as also postmodernist. The original publication is in the article “Multiple and Nonlinear Time in Beethoven’s Opus 135,” *Perspectives of New Music* 11, no. 2 (1973): 122–45.

call gestural time, in which temporal function is created not by the order of events but by their conventional profiles. For example, I consider a definitive cadence to be final in gestural time, whether or not it falls at the end of a performance in piece time.

One such cadence occurs in m. 10. It is possible to understand this gesture as a *final* cadence, despite its appearance early in the temporal continuum of the movement. This gesture (see example 1) has the impact “of a *final cadence*. It feels like, and has the shape of, an ending. In a certain sense, then, *it is the end*.”⁶ In piece time mm. 1–10 do, obviously, constitute an opening. But, in terms of gestural time, the movement *does end* in m. 10, because m. 10 is the place where we hear what we recognize as a final cadence. We subsequently move through piece time to discover the content of the movement that has just “ended” (in gestural time).

Piece time is diachronic: a piece unfolds note by note, gesture by gesture, phrase by phrase. Gestural time, however, is synchronic: a final cadence is recognized as such no matter where in the piece it occurs. Judy Lochhead’s excellent analogy for the difference between piece time and gestural time is worth quoting again:

After rising, one usually eats breakfast. This meal may include coffee, eggs, toast, etc. The act of “eating breakfast” is usually associated with the morning, but it is possible to “eat breakfast” at any time of day. The phrase has two meanings here. First, it may mean eating a meal in the morning [piece time]; second, eating the types of food associated with the morning meal [gestural time]. The sort of meaning which is determined by and strictly tied to temporal place-context . . . [is exemplified by] “eating breakfast” in the morning, no matter what is actually eaten; that which can be separated from its original and defining temporal place-context while still retaining part of its original significance . . . [is exemplified by]

⁶*The Time of Music*, 150.

Example 1. Beethoven, String Quartet in F Major, op. 135, first movement, mm. 1–10, leading to a “final” cadence

The image displays a musical score for the first movement of Beethoven's String Quartet in F Major, op. 135, measures 1 through 10. The score is written for two staves (treble and bass clef) in 2/4 time. The key signature is one flat (F major). The measures are numbered 1 through 10. Measure 1 is a whole rest in the treble and a half note F in the bass. Measure 2 has a half note G in the treble and a half note F in the bass. Measure 3 has a half note A in the treble and a half note G in the bass. Measure 4 has a half note B in the treble and a half note A in the bass, with a forte (sfz) dynamic marking. Measure 5 has a half note C in the treble and a half note B in the bass, with a piano (p) dynamic marking. Measure 6 has a half note D in the treble and a half note C in the bass, with a piano (p) dynamic marking. Measure 7 has a half note E in the treble and a half note D in the bass, with a piano (p) dynamic marking. Measure 8 has a half note F in the treble and a half note E in the bass, with a piano (p) dynamic marking. Measure 9 has a half note G in the treble and a half note F in the bass, with a piano (p) dynamic marking. Measure 10 has a half note A in the treble and a half note G in the bass, with a piano (p) dynamic marking. The score includes various musical notations such as rests, notes, beams, and dynamic markings (p, sfz, pizz.). The final measure (10) is marked with a piano (p) dynamic and the text "END???", suggesting a final cadence.

eating the foods associated with the morning no matter what time of day.⁷

The Time of Music's suggestion that the ending of the movement occurs in the tenth measure is a postmodernist idea. It postulates a multiple temporal continuum, with two separable orders of succession. One order depends on the succession of musical events as heard in performance, while the other depends on conventionally defined gestures that carry connotations of temporal function (beginning, ending, climax, transition, etc.) regardless of their immediate context. Such conventions are more clearly and thoroughly defined in tonal music (and, in particular, in classical-period tonal music—they form, for example, some of the “topics” of Kofi Agawu’s semiotics of classical music⁸).

My analysis of Beethoven’s Opus 135 separates gestural function from gestural placement. This separation depends on an absolutist view of function: I would call the cadence in m. 10 final no matter where it appeared. Gestural meanings interact with contextual meanings: m. 10 is gesturally a movement cadence but contextually an opening phrase-pair cadence. Measure 10 is not *simply* or *solely* an ending. There is disagreement between the inherent function of an ending gesture and the fact that it is encountered in a beginning context. The difference is between time as used (piece time, governed by the inevitability of succession and the syntax of tonal progression) and time as portrayed (gestural time, as suggested by inherent temporal functions of gestures).⁹

My multiple-time analysis further suggests that m. 9 leads directly to m. 25 (see example 2). That I understand m. 25 continuing from m. 10 does not contradict my assertion that the movement ends (in gestural time) in m. 10. The first theme group thus contains a paradox: an

⁷Judy Lochhead, “The Temporal in Beethoven’s Opus 135: When Are Ends Beginnings?” *In Theory Only* 4, no. 7 (January 1979): 4.

⁸See Kofi Agawu, *Playing with Signs: A Semiotic Interpretation of Classic Music* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991).

⁹*The Time of Music*, 152.

Example 2. Reconstruction of Beethoven, String Quartet op. 135, first movement, showing first continuity in exposition

The musical score is presented in three systems, each with two staves (treble and bass clef). The time signature is 2/4.

- System 1 (Measures 1-4):**
 - Measure 1: Treble staff has a whole rest; bass staff has a half note G2.
 - Measure 2: Treble staff has a half note A2; bass staff has a half note F2.
 - Measure 3: Treble staff has a half note B2; bass staff has a half note E2.
 - Measure 4: Treble staff has a chord of G4, A4, B4, C5 marked *sfz*; bass staff has a half note D3.
- System 2 (Measures 5-8):**
 - Measure 5: Treble staff has a half note D4 marked *p*; bass staff has a half note C3.
 - Measure 6: Treble staff has a half note E4 marked *p*; bass staff has a half note D3.
 - Measure 7: Treble staff has a half note F4; bass staff has a half note E3.
 - Measure 8: Treble staff has a half note G4; bass staff has a half note F3.
- System 3 (Measures 9-26):**
 - Measure 9: Treble staff has a half note A4 marked *poco cresc.*; bass staff has a half note G3.
 - Measure 25: Treble staff has a half note B4 marked *p*; bass staff has a half note A3.
 - Measure 26: Treble staff has a half note C5; bass staff has a half note B3.

Other markings include *pizz.* (pizzicato) in measure 4 and *arco* (arco) in measure 25.

Example 3. Reconstruction of Beethoven, String Quartet op. 135, first movement, showing second continuity in exposition

The musical score is presented in three systems, each with a treble and bass staff. The key signature is one flat (B-flat major), and the time signature is 2/4.

System 1 (Measures 11-14): The music begins with a piano (*p*) dynamic. Measures 11, 12, 13, and 14 are marked with boxed numbers. The melody in the treble staff is a series of eighth notes, while the bass staff provides a steady eighth-note accompaniment.

System 2 (Measures 15-38): Measure 15 is marked with a boxed number. The music continues with a piano (*p*) dynamic. Measures 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, and 38 are marked with boxed numbers. The melody in the treble staff features triplets and a crescendo (*cresc.*) marking. The bass staff also features triplets and a crescendo (*cresc.*) marking.

System 3 (Measures 39-41): Measures 39, 40, and 41 are marked with boxed numbers. The music continues with a piano (*p*) dynamic. Measure 40 is marked with a crescendo (*cresc.*) and a piano (*p.*) dynamic. Measure 41 is marked with a forte (*f*) dynamic. The melody in the treble staff features triplets and a crescendo (*cresc.*) marking. The bass staff also features triplets and a crescendo (*cresc.*) marking.

Example 3, continued

This musical score, labeled "Example 3, continued," spans measures 42 to 59. It is written for piano in a key with one flat (B-flat major or D minor) and a 3/4 time signature. The score is organized into three systems, each with a treble and bass staff.

Measure 42: Treble staff begins with a triplet of eighth notes (G4, A4, B4) and a quarter note (C5). Bass staff has a half note (B3) and a quarter note (C4). Dynamics: *f*.

Measure 43: Treble staff has a triplet of eighth notes (B4, C5, D5) and a quarter note (E5). Bass staff has a half note (C4) and a quarter note (D4). Dynamics: *f*.

Measure 44: Treble staff has a triplet of eighth notes (D5, E5, F5) and a quarter note (G5). Bass staff has a half note (D4) and a quarter note (E4). Dynamics: *pp*.

Measure 45: Treble staff has a triplet of eighth notes (E5, F5, G5) and a quarter note (A5). Bass staff has a half note (E4) and a quarter note (F4). Dynamics: *pp*.

Measure 52: Treble staff has a triplet of eighth notes (F5, G5, A5) and a quarter note (B5). Bass staff has a half note (F4) and a quarter note (G4). Dynamics: *pp*.

Measure 53: Treble staff has a triplet of eighth notes (G5, A5, B5) and a quarter note (C6). Bass staff has a half note (G4) and a quarter note (A4). Dynamics: *pp*.

Measure 54: Treble staff has a triplet of eighth notes (A5, B5, C6) and a quarter note (D6). Bass staff has a half note (A4) and a quarter note (B4). Dynamics: *cresc.*

Measure 55: Treble staff has a triplet of eighth notes (B5, C6, D6) and a quarter note (E6). Bass staff has a half note (B4) and a quarter note (C5). Dynamics: *p*.

Measure 56: Treble staff has a triplet of eighth notes (C6, D6, E6) and a quarter note (F6). Bass staff has a half note (C5) and a quarter note (D5). Dynamics: *cresc.*

Measure 57: Treble staff has a triplet of eighth notes (D6, E6, F6) and a quarter note (G6). Bass staff has a half note (D5) and a quarter note (E5). Dynamics: *f*.

Measure 17: Treble staff has a triplet of eighth notes (E6, F6, G6) and a quarter note (A6). Bass staff has a half note (E5) and a quarter note (F5). Dynamics: *p*.

Measure 18: Treble staff has a triplet of eighth notes (F6, G6, A6) and a quarter note (B6). Bass staff has a half note (F5) and a quarter note (G5). Dynamics: *p*.

Measure 19: Treble staff has a triplet of eighth notes (G6, A6, B6) and a quarter note (C7). Bass staff has a half note (G5) and a quarter note (A5). Dynamics: *p*.

And, like the Beethoven movement, it is a piece that once proved difficult for many listeners¹¹ but that today, when the postmodern impulse in music is widely recognized, begins to make a lot of sense.

Mahler called the movement “Rondo-Finale,” and, indeed, it exhibits a rondo-like structure. In a more normal rondo, thematic returns would coincide with moves back to the tonic, which would usually be underlined by V-I cadential articulations. In the Mahler movement there are returns of the rondo thematic material, which may or may not begin with the first rondo motive; returns to the tonic, which may or may not coincide with V-I progressions; returns to diatonicism after chromatic¹² passages; and returns to metric regularity after passages in which the hypermeter is uneven, and/or the heard meter conflicts with the written meter, and/or different contrapuntal voices project different meters simultaneously, and/or the meters alternate between duple and triple.

What is particularly interesting in this movement, and unsettling, and in my view postmodern, is the manner in which these various returns rarely coincide. If a progression back to the tonic has articulatory power, particularly when it coincides with a V-I cadence, then why should it not coincide with a reappearance of the rondo theme? The reason is that the movement questions formal structuring by means of coinciding harmonic, tonal, and thematic recapitulation. One of the principal structures of tonal form—recapitulation, as supported in several musical parameters—is overthrown. This is not the kind of overthrowing of all of tonality that was soon to emerge in the works of Schoenberg and Webern, however. Their invention was

¹¹James Zychowicz explains that some of the finale’s first reviewers were quite enthusiastic, but subsequent critical opinion was quite negative, until relatively recently. See “Ein schlechter Jasager: Considerations on the Finale to Mahler’s Seventh Symphony,” in Zychowicz, ed., *The Seventh Symphony of Gustav Mahler: A Symposium* (Cincinnati: University of Cincinnati, 1990), 98–106.

¹²In this analysis I use the word “chromaticism” in a restricted sense. I consider any passage with chromatic alterations, even if they are simply members of secondary dominant chords, to be “chromatic.” Passages with no chromaticism are considered “diatonic.”

modernist, while Mahler's was, paradoxically (since it occurred earlier), postmodernist. He did not eschew tonal, thematic, or harmonic return. He used them, but in ways that compromised, redefined, and deconstructed their traditional meanings and functions. In a postmodern manner, he used history to destroy history. He used tonality to destroy tonal form. He thereby made tonal form not the structure of this movement but its topic. He created a narrative in which the characters are tonality, harmony, and theme (*not* particular themes, but the general concept of musical theme). Tonality operates, but without the crucial component of dominant support. Harmony operates, but fundamental root movements sometimes do and sometimes do not have truly articulatory impact. And themes certainly exist. They abound, in fact. Because the rondo theme often starts at some point other than its beginning, however, thematic recapitulation is compromised. And because certain motives migrate from one thematic group to another, thematic identity is also compromised.

Let us look at some instances of out-of-phase structures. (1) The final return to C major occurs at m. 517 (see example 4). There is little impact at the instant of arrival, even though the music has been away from C major for quite some time. With no preceding dominant, the arrival harmonies (beginning with an appoggiatura IV) take place over a V pedal; the dynamic is soft; the material is not from the rondo theme; and the scoring is strings only—not exactly what one would expect at a major structural articulation. A few measures later, at m. 538, the rondo theme does return, with root-position tonic support, strong brass and woodwind scoring, *fortissimo* dynamic, and clear harmony (although still no preparatory dominant). Even this close to the end, the music is out of phase: the tonic key returns at m. 517, while the root-position tonic harmony and rondo theme return at m. 538.

(2) Consider the rondo return at m. 120 (example 5). Thematically it would seem to be a major articulation: the rondo theme returns, with the original motives from m. 7 presented at the outset—although there are certainly changes. This return would seem to be more definitive than the previous one in m. 79, which begins not with the initial rondo material but with the second phrase. Furthermore, at m. 79 the music

Example 4. Mahler, Seventh Symphony, finale, mm. 506–43

Feierlich

506 507 508 509

upper strings, cls., obs

ff

tpts.

ff

lower strings, timp.

ff

< sfz

510 511 512

< sfz

fff

f

513 514 515

sfz sfz

dim.

dim.

molto rit.

fls., obs., cls.

cresc.

Example 4, continued

516 517 518

vlns.
vlas. *pp*
vc.
pp *leggiere*
trbs., tuba
cb.
p pizz.

519 520 521

vlas.
vlas. *sfz* *tr*
hns.
cb. *pp*
cb., vc. *pp*
pp arco *pp*

522 523 524

sfz *tr*
cls., bsns.
timp.
cb., vc.
obs., Eng. hn., cls. *tr*
p *sfz* *p* *sfz*
timp. *sfz*
cb., vc. *sfz*
pizz.

Example 4, continued

525 *< sfz pp* obs., Eng. hn., bsns. *p* arco

526 vlns. 1, fls. *tr* *tr* *tr* tpts. *p* *sfz* cls., bsns. *p* *f*

527 vlns. 1 *sfz pp* vlns. 2, vlns. *pp*

528 *< sfz pp* timp. *pp*

529 *cresc.* *tr* *tr* *tr* cb., vc. *pp pizz.*

531 *pp subito* obs., cls. *p* arco

532 *tr* *tr* *tr* *< sfz p*

533 tpt. 3 fls., obs. vla., vc. *pp*

Detailed description: This musical score page contains measures 525 through 533. It is a multi-staff score with three systems. The first system (measures 525-527) features woodwinds (obs., Eng. hn., bsns.), strings (vlns. 1, fls., vlns. 2, vlns.), brass (tpts., cls., bsns.), and a bass line. Dynamics include *sfz pp*, *p*, *f*, and *pp*. The second system (measures 528-529) includes woodwinds, timpani (timp.), and strings (cb., vc.). Dynamics include *sfz pp*, *pp*, and *pp pizz.*. The third system (measures 531-533) features woodwinds (obs., cls., fls., obs.), brass (tpt. 3), and strings (vla., vc.). Dynamics include *pp subito*, *p*, *pp*, and *sfz p*. Trills (*tr*) are marked in measures 526, 529, and 532. Crescendo (*cresc.*) is marked in measure 529. The word *arco* appears under the bass line in measures 525 and 531.

Example 4, continued

534 535 536 **accelerando** vlns., Eb cl., fls.
ff

537 winds, strings, hns. 538 tpts. 539 tpt. 1, winds
ff hns. trbs., tuba
ff timp.
f

540 541 542 543
hns., tpts.
tr tr tr tr tr tr

Detailed description of the musical score: The score is written for a large ensemble. It consists of three systems of staves. The first system (measures 534-536) has three staves: a bass staff, a treble staff, and a lower bass staff. Measure 534 has a bass line and a treble line with chords. Measure 535 continues the bass line and treble line. Measure 536 introduces a new section with 'accelerando' and 'ff' dynamics for various instruments. The second system (measures 537-539) has three staves. Measure 537 has a bass line and a treble line. Measure 538 continues the bass line and treble line. Measure 539 introduces a new section with 'ff' dynamics for various instruments. The third system (measures 540-543) has three staves. Measure 540 has a bass line and a treble line. Measure 541 continues the bass line and treble line. Measure 542 continues the bass line and treble line. Measure 543 continues the bass line and treble line.

moves suddenly from A \flat major to C major, while in mm. 84–87 there is a strong cadential progression in C. Tonal return (m. 79) is out of phase with cadential arrival (m. 87). Soon (mm. 116–20) there is a still more pointed progression in C: V/V/V/V/V to V/V/V/V to V/V/V to vi⁶ (a sidestep) to V/V to V to I. The downbeat of m. 120, furthermore, coincides with a move from chromaticism to diatonicism. Thus m. 120 seems to be a major articulation, a strong arrival. But it does not feel that way, because—despite the directional harmonic progression to I in C—the tonality has not really been away from C major since before m. 79, and the V-I cadence in mm. 119–20 simply echoes that in mm. 86–87. Notice that the apparent D major in mm. 106–15 is too brief, and too clearly V/V in C major, to be heard as a tonal contrast. Tonally the big return is in m. 79, after the A \flat major passage, although it is not supported by a V-I cadence; there are two V-I cadences (mm. 87 and 120), neither of which marks a tonal return; thematically the big return is in m. 120. The tonal and thematic recapitulations are therefore out of phase, both with each other and with the two V-I cadences. As a result, the sense of formal articulation is compromised, and along with it the meaning of rondo form and of tonal structuring.

(3) There is a big half cadence in m. 367 (example 6). The music subsequently resolves this V to I in m. 368. This gesture is so blatant that it oversteps the bounds of even this all-permitting movement. It parodies, or deconstructs, tonal cadence: it *is* one, but it does not function as one. What, indeed, does this obvious V-I articulate? Not a rondo return (which occurs a few bars earlier in m. 360) and not a tonic return (the music is in B \flat major) and not even a modulation to a fresh key (the music has been in B \flat since m. 360). The move to B \flat occurs with the rondo theme at m. 360 (without V-I cadence), while the big V-I progression occurs eight bars later, out of phase.

These out-of-phase thematic returns, tonal returns, harmonic cadences, re-emergences of metric regularity, and returns of diatonicism are a few among many instances of multiple time structures in the movement. There are places, however, where these elements are partially in phase, where some of them do occur together. When some elements cooperate, the result is not, as might be expected, a major

[illegible]

Example 5, continued

86 *pesante* *tr*

87 *vlns.*

88

89 *tr* *mf* lower strings, bsns.

90 *f* *vlas., vc.*

91

92 *winds* *pp* *hn. 2* *p* bsn. 1

93

94

95

96

97

TONIC CADENCE

timp.

V *f* I

The musical score is presented in three systems, each with three staves. The first system (measures 86-89) features a treble staff with a *pesante* tempo marking and a *tr* (trill) in measure 86, and a bass staff with a *f* (forte) dynamic and a *V* (Vergeltung) marking. The second system (measures 90-93) includes a *f* (forte) dynamic and a *vlas., vc.* (viola, violoncello) marking in measure 90, and a *pp* (pianissimo) dynamic and a *hn. 2* (horn 2) marking in measure 92. The third system (measures 94-97) continues the musical notation. The score is marked with measure numbers 86 through 97 in boxes. The key signature is one flat (B-flat), and the time signature is 2/2. The score includes various musical notations such as notes, rests, trills, and dynamics.

Example 5, continued

Grazioso

The musical score is divided into four systems, each containing two staves (treble and bass clef). The measures are numbered 98 through 111. The tempo is marked **Grazioso**. The key signature has two sharps (F# and C#). The score includes various dynamic markings such as *f*, *sfz*, *p*, *pp*, *mf*, and *fz*. Articulations like *tr* (trill) and *fls.* (flageolet) are present. The instrumentation includes flutes and clarinets (fls., cls.), violins and viola (vlns., vlns. 2, vlns., vlns. 1, vlns. 2, vlns.), winds, horns (hns.), trumpet (tpt.), timpani (timp.), and viola (vlas.). The score shows a complex interplay of these instruments, with some measures featuring multiple layers of sound.

Measures 98-101: *f*, *sfz*, *p*, *pp*, *fls., cls.*, *vlns. 2, vlns.*, *sfz*, *p*.

Measures 102-104: *tr*, *sfz*, *p*, *pp*, *fls.*, *vlns.*, *sfz*, *p*.

Measures 105-107: *sfz*, *p*, *vlns., winds*, *f*, *vlns.*, *fz*, *sfz*.

Measures 108-111: *tr*, *p*, *mf*, *vlns. 1*, *hns., tpt. 1*, *timp.*, *mf*, *p*, *tpt. 1*, *p*, *vlns. 2, vlns.*, *hns.*, *fz*, *p*, *vc.*, *sfz*, *p*.

Example 5, continued

112 113 114 115

p *f* *sfz* *p*

tpt. 1
vlns. 2, vlas.
+ hns. 1, 2
vc., cb.
cresc.
cresc. hns.

116 117 118 119

f *f* *sfz* *f*

winds, strings, hns.
tpts.

f V/V/V/V/V V/V/V/V V/V/V (vi⁶) V/V V

120 121 122 123

hns.
+ winds
ff

I
RETURN OF DIATONICISM

structural downbeat, but rather just another contrast, another juncture, which happens to involve some coordination among the elements. This happens because *all* of these parameters *never* work completely together. Some element always contradicts the others, always seeks to destroy whatever sectional articulation the others are creating. The temporality of this movement is thus deeply multiple.

A V-I cadence robbed of its structural implications provides one kind of irony. Thematic returns, tonal returns, returns to metric regularity, and returns to diatonicism also cannot be trusted to mean

Example 6. Mahler, Seventh Symphony, finale, mm. 357–71

This musical score excerpt covers measures 357 through 371 of the finale of Mahler's Seventh Symphony. The score is written for a large orchestra and includes the following parts and markings:

- Measures 357-360:** Features a complex texture with multiple staves. The top staff includes markings for *cls.* (clarinet), *+ vlas.* (viola), and *vlas.* (viola). The bottom staff includes *vc.* (viola) and *cb.* (contrabass). Dynamics range from *sfz* (sforzando) to *pp* (pianissimo). A *f* (forte) marking is present for *tpts., winds* (trumpets and winds) in measure 360.
- Measures 361-363:** The top staff features *f p* (forte piano) and *tpts.* (trumpets). The bottom staff includes *ff* (fortissimo) for *hns.* (horns) and *f* (forte) for *trbs., tuba* (trumpets and tuba). A *p* (piano) marking is also present.
- Measures 364-367:** The top staff includes *f p* (forte piano) and *cresc.* (crescendo). The bottom staff features *f* (forte) for *trbs., tuba* and *ff* (fortissimo) for *hns.* (horns). A *sfz* (sforzando) marking is present in measure 367.
- Measures 368-371:** The top staff includes *ff* (fortissimo) for *strings*. The bottom staff is mostly empty, with a *p* (piano) marking in measure 371.

Example 7. Coincidence and non-coincidence of arrivals in different parameters

<i>Measure no.</i>	<i>Initiate a new section?</i>	<i>Coincide with return of Rondo theme?</i>	<i>Coincide with tonic return?</i>	<i>V - I cadence?</i>	<i>Coincide with return to diatonicism</i>	<i>Coincide with return to metric regularity?</i>
7	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes
15	no	no	no	yes	no	no
23	no	no	no	yes	yes	no
45	no	no	no	no	no	yes
67	no	no	no	no	yes	no
79	yes	yes*	yes	no	no	yes
87	yes	no	no	yes	yes	no
100	no	no	no	yes	yes	no
120	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	no
136	no	no	no	yes	yes	no
143	no	no	no	no	no	yes
166	no	no	no	yes	no	no
179	no	no	no	yes	yes	no
189	yes	yes*	no	no	no	yes
197	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	no
220	yes	no	no	no	yes	no
227	no	no	no	no	yes	yes
244	no	no	no	no	yes	no
260	yes	yes**	yes	no	yes	yes
268	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	no
286	no	no	yes	no	no	no
291	yes	yes*	no	no	no	yes
342	no	no	no	yes	yes	no
351	no	no	no	yes	yes	no
360	yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes
368	yes	no	no	yes	no	no
377	no	no	no	no	yes	no
411	yes	no	yes	yes	no	no
430	no	no	no	yes	no	no
446	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	no
462	no	no	no	no	yes	no
486	no	no	no	no	yes	no
506	no	no	no	no	yes	no
517	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no
538	yes	yes	no	no	yes	no
554	no	no	no	yes	yes	no
573	no	no	no	no	no	yes
581	no	no	no	yes	no	no

Example 7, continued

* rondo return does not begin with initial (m. 7) material

** considerably altered

NB. if diatonicism or metric regularity continues, there is no return. If diatonicism returns two or three measures before an articulation in another parameter, it is considered to coincide (since it is impossible to sense an exact instant of return to diatonicism, and because this happens several times).

V-I cadences is striking. Something which is normal in tonal ritornello forms, and which surely might be expected in a movement with frequent returns to the tonic and to the rondo theme, simply does not happen. If it had, that event might have become a central focus for the movement. As it is, there *is* no central focus: no strongest arrival back home, no biggest structural downbeat, no unequivocal recapitulation. Rather, the idea of return is multifaceted in this movement, with many types and degrees of recapitulation, all of which are to some degree and in some way compromised. Every return is partial. Every return is also not a return.

(4) Even apart from the question of V-I support, we never experience the normal resolution of recapitulation. Every time the rondo material comes back it is undercut either by being in a non-tonic key, by occurring after the tonic key has already come back, or by beginning with material other than its opening motives.

The movement's title leads us to expect certain kinds of structures. They are not absent, but they are radically redefined, losing much of their traditional meaning and gaining new meanings in the process. Big, fully orchestrated V-I cadences, for example, rarely mark major structural junctures, whereas unexpected harmonic juxtapositions do. Thus the V-I cadential gesture becomes not so much a functional harmonic progression as a musical object, rich in association, connotation, and intertextual resonance. It exists prominently on the surface, but not in the deep structure, where the dominant key is absent.

The five potentially articulative structures listed in example 7 show what I mean by the multiplicity of time in this movement. In a more typical rondo, these elements would usually or always coincide, and the

time structure would be straightforward. In this movement, however, temporal articulations in some parameters do not coincide with structural articulations in other parameters. Since each parameter has a quasi-independent structure, the movement's temporality is—in a quintessentially postmodern manner—multiple.

Multiple Narratives in Ives

Postmodernism recognizes and celebrates intertextuality. Some theorists of the postmodern believe that quotation is not only a decision by the artist but an unavoidable aspect of artistic creation, since all artworks are necessarily related to other artworks. Recent postmodern music is usually pervasively intertextual. It tends to include either references to other types or bodies of music, or quotations (literal or altered) of specific other pieces, or both. Since recent postmodern pieces often refer to tonality, even when they are not really tonal, the appearance of tonality within a larger context that also includes atonality or polytonality or distorted tonality constitutes an intertextual reference to the procedures, if not specific compositions, of the tonal period. Tonality carries historical connotations, which—particularly if brought into postmodern juxtaposition with modernist music—produce an undercurrent of association, of narrative, that counterpoints the various directed motions—whether tonal or not—within the music.

Ives's *Putnam's Camp* anticipates such postmodernist temporal multiplicity. It includes, for example, both continuities created by textural/dynamic/etc. moves and continuities created by tonality itself. In addition, there are the webs of association, wherein familiar tunes and familiar tonal gestures and progressions create narratives—which may well be different from person to person, depending on the various memories (if any!) evoked by the American patriotic and folk tunes. These temporal narratives move along in counterpoint, creating a multiplicity of musical time that is more multi-layered (because it is less pure) than what modernism, even at its most densely layered, ever created. Compared with the multiplicities of timelines and tempos in a dense score by Carter or Ferneyhough, for example, those of Ives are indeed more varied. Carter's and Ferneyhough's multiplicities are very

complex, but each line works by means of the same sorts of principles, whereas in a postmodern work like *Putnam's Camp*, each layer of temporality is independent because it works on a totally different plane.

Putnam's Camp uses such modernist and postmodernist techniques as collage, dense dissonance, and simultaneous tempos to create a work of nostalgia for nineteenth-century America and—if we consider Ives's literary program (shown in example 8)—for the America of the Revolutionary War period. This intertextuality contributes to the temporal multiplicity of the work, which emanates from (1) its progression through piece time, achieved by textural and tonal means, (2) the programmatic narrative Ives devised for the work and presented as a score preface (example 8), (3) the associations that the quoted material evokes in each listener, and (4) the relations between the piece and numerous other pieces from other historical eras.

Multiple time is suggested in a literal way when the music seems to proceed in more than one tempo simultaneously. This happens in several places. Typical is the passage beginning at m. 67 (see example 9). Here, against a clear quarter-note pulse, bassoon, snare drum, some violas, and piano enter with march-like material at a different tempo—the dotted quarter represents the beat for these instruments. The temporal independence of this instrumental layer becomes more pronounced when the first trumpet enters (m. 70, then m. 72), playing two fragments of the song "The British Grenadiers" in the tempo not of the majority of the orchestra but of the conflicting bassoon/drum/viola/piano beat. Since "British Grenadiers" subdivides its beat in half and then in quarters, there is little possibility of hearing the dotted-quarter beat as subdivided in thirds according to the eighth-note pulse of the main orchestra.

There are many ways a listener may react to this quotation of "British Grenadiers." He/she may know the tune as a patriotic American song, thus possibly having thoughts and feelings about patriotic music and its relationship to this particular context. Or he/she may know the tune as British, with somewhat different connotations (Ives explains the dual nationality of the tune in the last paragraph of his preface, example 8). If the listener knows the words of either version (or of both), they may come back to consciousness when the

Example 8. Preface to Ives's *Putnam's Camp*

Near Redding Center, Conn. is a small park preserved as a Revolutionary Memorial: for here General Israel Putnam's soldiers had their winter quarters in 1778–1779. Long rows of stone camp fire-places still remain to stir a child's imagination. The hardships which the soldiers endured and the agitation of a few hot-heads to break camp and march to the Hartford Assembly for relief, is a part of Redding history.

Once upon a "4th of July," some time ago, so the story goes, a child went there on a picnic, held under the auspices of the First Church and the Village Cornet Band. Wandering away from the rest of the children past the camp ground into the woods, he hopes to catch a glimpse of some of the old soldiers. As he rests on the hillside of laurel and hickories, the tunes of the band and the songs of the children grow fainter and fainter [mm. 53–63];—when—"mirabile dictu" [m. 64]—over the trees on the crest of the hill he sees a tall woman standing. She reminds him of a picture he had of the Goddess of Liberty,—but the face is sorrowful—she is pleading with the soldiers [oboe, mm. 67ff.] not to forget their "cause" and the great sacrifices they have made for it. But they march out of camp with fife and drum to a popular tune of the day [trumpet and drum, mm. 68ff., which is the version of "British Grenadiers" shown in example 9]. Suddenly a new national note is heard [mm. 89ff., followed by another quotation of "British Grenadiers"]. Putnam is coming over the hills from the center,—the soldiers turn back and cheer. The little boy awakes, he hears the children's songs [mm. 114–19, return of the *Putnam's Camp* melody] and runs down past the monument to "listen to the band" [mm. 126ff., "British Grenadiers" combined with the *Putnam's Camp* tune plus another tune] and join in the games and dances [e.g., mm. 134ff., "British Grenadiers" plus another folk tune].

The repertoire of national airs at that time was meagre. Most of them were of English origin. It is a curious fact that a tune very popular with the American soldiers was 'The British Grenadiers.' A captain in one of Putnam's regiments put it to words, which were sung for the first time in 1779 at a patriotic meeting in the Congressional Church in Redding Center; the text is both ardent and interesting.

Copyright (c) 1935 Mercury Music Corporation
Used By Permission

tune is heard, or they may influence whatever emotional connotations the listener harbors for the melody. But the words of the two versions conjure up rather different associations.

While some listeners may know one or both sets of these words, many will not. Of those who do not, some will nonetheless recognize the tune and perhaps have distinct and personal memories of it, perhaps from childhood. Others may not know the melody at all and thus may take it as an archetypal folk song or as some music Ives concocted

Example 9. Ives, *Putnam's Camp*, mm. 67-72

67 68 69

Poco meno mosso (about 92-88 =)

trumpet

bsn, s. drum, vlas, pno

ppp

ppp

oboe

mf

clarinet

p

strings

p

p

70 71 72

4

pp

3

4

sufficient. I am not so concerned with how valid or complete the understanding of such students was as I am intrigued by how utterly different the piece must have been for them, compared to how it was for me. Despite a lot of analysis about shared perceptions (of such structural aspects as rhythmic irregularities, harmony, set constructs, and interplay of tonality and atonality), everyone in the seminar had different (as well as common) experiences with the music. In a certain sense, there were as many pieces as there were seminar members!

Intertextual references meaning different things to different listeners, depending on their previous experiences with the quoted material, is not unique to or original with Ives. The references in *Putnam's Camp*, however, are more extensive than those in music I would not call postmodern. In contrast to earlier music with quotations, Ives's score contains a multitude of references, only some of which are identified in his preface. Not only are several American tunes broadly quoted, but also there are potential quotations of such brevity that it is difficult to decide whether or not they really are citations, and there is material apparently composed by Ives (although, should some later scholar trace them to a folk source, our understanding of them might well change) but in a quasi-folk style. Some of Ives's quotations are buried so deep within dense orchestral textures that only a most selective performance can allow them to be heard clearly. It is therefore unlikely that any one listener will know, or will even hear, all of these references. Each listener will have his/her own set of passages recognized, and for each recognition there may well be very different personal associations with the melodies and/or their original texts.

Consider, for example, the dense layering of quotations beginning at m. 27 (see example 10). The following tunes are played *simultaneously*: Stephen Foster's "Massa's in de Cold Ground" (flutes, first clarinet, and first horn), Sousa's "Liberty Bell" March (oboes, violas, and second clarinet), "Arkansas Traveler" (trumpet), Sousa's "Semper Fidelis" March (tuba and third trombone, coinciding with "Massa" in m. 28), a traditional marching cadence in the snare and bass drums and cymbal, a bugle call in a bassoon, the main theme of *Putnam's Camp* (violins) as first introduced back in m. 6, and various accompanimental figures. Different listeners will doubtless respond

specifically for programmatic purposes. Even without knowing the tune's origin, it should be possible to recognize m. 70 as a whole-tone distortion and m. 72 as a chromatic distortion, both of a diatonic source.

Thus different listeners may have very different reactions to the fragments of "British Grenadiers" that appear a few measures into the *Andante animato* section of *Putnam's Camp* (example 9). For many listeners, their own personal associations will contribute to the creation in their minds of an unfolding narrative of the music. I do not mean to imply that every listener will hear *Putnam's Camp* as a narrative (although the intertextual references are certainly conducive to narratological interpretation), but only that those who do hear it so may experience quite different narratives, depending in part on each listener's prior knowledge of and associations with the material quoted (I refer not only to this one reference to "British Grenadiers," but to numerous other quotations of this and other songs).

The more you know about "The British Grenadiers"—its musical structure, its text(s), and its history, particularly with respect to the American patriotic version—the better position you are in to understand *Putnam's Camp*. But I would argue that the listener unfamiliar with "British Grenadiers" can nonetheless have a personal and meaningful experience with Ives's composition, even if that experience is less than fully informed.

Not long ago, I asked a graduate analysis seminar to study *Putnam's Camp*. Several of the seminar participants were from countries other than the United States and hence had little knowledge of American folk music and patriotic songs. Even some of the American participants did not recognize most of the quotations in Ives's score. One student recognized only "The Star-Spangled Banner" in the penultimate measure—a possibly obscure quotation, since it contains only the first four notes, which constitute a generic major triad. I suggested that those who did not recognize the distinction between quoted and original material, and those who did not know anything about the historical and cultural contexts of the quoted music, had a skewed understanding of the music. Several students objected vehemently, claiming that they recognized American vernacular idioms as such and that that was

Example 10. Ives, *Putnam's Camp*, mm. 27-36

fl., cl., hn. 27 28
 Massa in de Cold Ground

[Piano omitted]

mf *Putnam's Camp*

sfz tpt. Arkansas Traveler

ob. Liberty Bell

ob., cl. **f**

vln. **ff** marching drum cadence

s.d. **f**

b.d.

mp phn. **f** trb., tuba Semper Fidelis

vla., cl.

vc. **f**

bsn. **mf** bugle call

f cb., vc. oom-pah bass

Example 10, continued

29

30

Marching through Georgia

fl., cl.

f

bsn., hn., vc.

ff

The musical score is written for a marching band. It consists of two systems, measures 29 and 30. The key signature is B-flat major (two flats). Measure 29 features a complex melodic line in the flute/clarinet part, with triplets in the bass line. Measure 30 continues the melody and includes a 'Marching through Georgia' section. Dynamics include forte (f) and fortissimo (ff). The score is for a marching band and includes parts for flute, clarinet, bassoon, horn, and voice.

Example 10, continued

31

32

fl., ob.

Battle Cry of Freedom

tpt., trb.

pp

mf

f

cl., tpt., hn.

vla.

p

f

hn.

mp

vc.

vc., cb., bsn.

f pizz.

p

f

Example 10, continued

33 34

tpt., trb.
Marching through Georgia

vln.

vla.

hn.

vc., cb., bsn.

tpt. Yankee Doodle
mf

trb.
mf

Detailed description of the musical score: The score is written for a five-staff ensemble. The first staff (top) is for trumpet and trombone (tpt., trb.). The second staff is for violin (vln.). The third staff is for viola (vla.). The fourth staff is for horn (hn.). The fifth staff (bottom) is for double bass, contrabass, and bassoon (vc., cb., bsn.). Measure 33 (left) shows the beginning of 'Marching through Georgia' for the trumpet and trombone. The string section (vln., vla., hn., vc., cb., bsn.) provides a rhythmic accompaniment. Measure 34 (right) shows the beginning of 'Yankee Doodle' for the trumpet and trombone, marked with a mezzo-forte (mf) dynamic and an accent (^). The string section continues its accompaniment. The key signature is one flat (B-flat major or D minor), and the time signature is 4/4.

Example 10, continued

35

pic.

f Yankee Doodle

mp

Yankee Doodle

strings

f

cl., bsn.

mp

36

Oh, Suzanna

ff

Copyright (c) 1935 Mercury Music Corporation
Used By Permission

differently to this passage, for two types of reasons: (1) the acoustic limitations of perceiving several melodies at once and (2) differing knowledge of, experience with, and associations with the tunes. The fact that the passage is largely diatonic and quite simply tonal helps make it less chaotic than later passages in the movement, but it does render the music rather homogeneous, perhaps making it more difficult to pick out some of the tunes. "Arkansas Traveler" may well obliterate "Liberty Bell," since both are played in the same register, and trumpets (marked *forte*) tend to overpower oboes and clarinet (marked *mezzo forte*) plus violas (marked *forte*). The *Putnam's Camp* melody, since it was recently heard clearly, is perhaps more likely to be recognized than "Massa's in de Cold Ground," played by *mezzo forte* flutes in a weak register plus *mezzo piano* clarinet and horn. The *forte* bass line, "Semper Fidelis," may well be heard clearly. The bugle call in one

bassoon is unlikely to be heard at all. The unique timbre of the drum cadence helps to make this layer audible. How much each tune can be perceived actually depends in large part on the conductor's balance decisions and on the engineer's manipulations (if the performance is recorded or broadcast). But, even if we assume a maximally transparent performance, it is unlikely that anyone will be able to apprehend all five or six snippets simultaneously and recognize them and process them mentally and conjure up associations with all of them. Various experiments in music perception suggest that it is quite difficult to perceive even fewer melodies played simultaneously. A talented, experienced, and sympathetic listener may jump back and forth between these five or six tunes, but they do not last long enough to permit many such changes of attentional focus. By m. 30, all of the quotations—with the exception of the *Putnam's Camp* melody—have dissipated, to make way for further citations of "The Battle Cry of Freedom" (first trumpet and first trombone, mm. 32–34), "Yankee Doodle" (first trumpet, followed by piccolo, followed by strings, mm. 34–36), and Foster's "Oh, Suzanna" (first violins, m. 36).

Sometimes when I hear the passage beginning in m. 27 I focus on the two Sousa themes, "Liberty Bell" and "Semper Fidelis." These marches have particular psychological resonance for me. When I was an adolescent, I spent many hours in marching bands, which often performed these and other Sousa marches in parades and at football games. Sometimes when hearing *Putnam's Camp* I may actually recall some of these happy experiences from my youth, but more often hearing the Sousa tunes brings back pleasant and nostalgic emotions whose source may be my experiences in my school and college bands, even though I do not conjure up specific memories or images of particular events. I usually cannot avoid these special feelings while listening to Ives's work. They form part of my own special version of his piece, part of my own narrative path through the work, a path that may not have much to do with the composer's own narrative.

Ives's program (example 8) in itself suggests multiple time. The first paragraph (and also the last, in which he discusses "The British Grenadiers") refers to the time of the American Revolution. Ives's actual narrative, however, seems to depict the time of his own youth.

Probably he himself is the small boy who wanders from a Fourth of July picnic, apparently falls asleep, and enters dream time, where he sees the Goddess of Liberty urging soldiers onward. The boy eventually awakens and rejoins the external time of picnic games and dances.

I believe that the temporality of *Putnam's Camp* is multiple not only because Ives used and invoked different time frames, and not just because different listeners may construct and experience divergent narratives while listening, but also because these narratives are only partially dependent on the musical structure. I can listen to and look at the interplays of metric regularity and irregularity, thick and thin textures, consonance and dissonance, and tonality and atonality in order to create and experience a structural path through the time of *Putnam's Camp*. Were I to make a thorough structural analysis, I would be trying to elucidate this path. When I listen in a structural manner, I am aware of and do respond to the pacing of these interplays. But my own personal narrative time as I listen does not simply coincide with this structural hearing, although the two are not unrelated either. Since my narrative depends in part on the emotions and memories that I associate with the various tunes quoted (and also with other experiences I have had listening to this often-heard composition), it is uniquely my own. I am sensitive to the counterpoint between several temporal paths: a quasi-objective structural reading, my own personal narrative based on recollections, and Ives's program. Each of these sources offers me a way through the piece, but I prefer, rather than to choose from among them, to savor them all—in alternation or in counterpoint. Hence the multiple temporality of *Putnam's Camp*, and hence my postmodernist appreciation of this work.

I hope this discussion has shown how the intertextual references in Ives's piece join hands with internal multiple structures to form a context rich in potential for listening from multiple perspectives, and for creating diverse narratives shaped by the listener's personal associations with quoted materials, by Ives's own narrative program, by the specifics of a given performance, and by the musical structure. *Putnam's Camp* may offer particularly varied temporal structures and experiences (although it is not the most multi-layered of Ives's creations—consider, for example, the second movement of the Fourth

Symphony), but it is not unique in lending itself to a postmodernist multiple understanding. Any music which contains references outside itself (the Mahler Seventh finale, for example, refers to marches, dances, and popular songs), and indeed any music with any reasonable degree of complexity (such as the quite involved opening movement of Beethoven's Opus 135), can conjure different temporal experiences in different listeners, or even in the same listener on different occasions. A postmodernist understanding of any music is therefore theoretically possible, although some pieces—like the three I have been discussing—appeal particularly keenly to the postmodern sensibility.¹⁴

¹⁴This article draws on, but does not duplicate, several conference presentations. They include "The Finale of Mahler's Seventh Symphony Viewed from a Postmodernist Perspective," delivered at the Music Analysis Conference, Lancaster University, 24 September 1994; "Postmodern Concepts of Musical Time," delivered at the Centennial Conference of the Faculty of Music of the University of Melbourne, 8 June 1995; "Concepts of Time and Chaos in Postmodern Music," delivered to the triennial conference of the International Society for the Study of Time, Sainte Adèle, Québec, Canada, 6 July 1995; and "Concepts postmodernes du Temps musical," delivered to the colloquium "Le Temps et la Forme: une épistémologie de la connaissance musicale," University of Geneva, 28 October 1995. The Geneva paper is published in *Actes du Colloque 'Le Temps et la Forme,'* ed. Etienne Darbellay (Geneva, 1997).